

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2754,  
ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOP-  
MENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT,  
2004

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 444, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2754) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 7, 2003, at page H11010).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that has a conference agreement of \$27.3 billion. This is a good bill. We worked very hard on it, and we have had a very tough conference; and I hope everybody will vote for the bill.

At this time I would like to make a few remarks concerning the committee staff on both sides. We worked together very diligently to prepare this bill and this conference report. I guess this is my second time to conference the bill, but my first time to be involved in the writing of the bill, which is a rather unusual circumstance.

During that period of time, and for the last number of years, our clerk has had different people being the chairman. And I do not know whether it is because I became the chairman that he is leaving or not. He has had a different chairman about the last five times, and so I said I was going to stay awhile, and then suddenly I heard he was going to retire. So I hope it is not because of the conference we have had that he is leaving, because he has done a great job. He has been 15 years here in this committee. He likes apparently the challenge of breaking in a new chairman, but I am not sure that he likes the continuation of that. But he will have to speak afterwards about that.

I really want to thank him because he has been a great help to me and a great help to the staff as we have worked on this bill. He was dubbed "Silent Bob" in one of the reports that was out, I think it was in one of what we call local political rags here around Washington. While most people might say he is silent, I can tell you when he is in the room and Silent Bob speaks, we all listen. He has done a great job for this committee. He has been a great resource to me and to the committee over these years.

So I want to thank him, and I hope he can go out and work on his golf game because he tells me his game is about as bad as mine, and that is really bad. So now he will have plenty of time

to learn how to play golf better and also to probably earn a lot more money, as he can come back and lobby us about a lot of issues because he is a real authority, especially on the water part of this bill.

So, again, thanks to you, Bob, for being the clerk for all these years and for leading us during this period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a document detailing the specifics of this appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference report on H.R. 2754, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2004.

We had a challenging conference with the Senate this year, but we were able to resolve our differences and reach a fair compromise. Most importantly, I believe we did the right thing for the Nation in this conference report in a number of important areas, from rebuilding our water infrastructure, to dealing with the disposal of spent nuclear fuel, to advancing the frontiers of our scientific knowledge.

The total amount of funding included in the conference agreement is \$27.3 billion. This represents an increase of \$1.1 billion over the current fiscal year and approximately \$380 million over the budget request.

Title I of this conference report provides funding for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and for the Corps' Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program. The conference agreement provides the Corps with \$4.6 billion, slightly below the current year but nearly \$400 million over the inadequate budget request. The Administration does not seem to comprehend that underfunding the Corps of Engineers ultimately costs the country more in the long run, as projects that are strung out over multiple years always cost more than they would if constructed on an efficient schedule. I have already initiated a dialog with the Administration in an attempt to convince them of the need to increase funding to support the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers in future fiscal years.

In fiscal year 2004, we opted to focus our available resources on completing ongoing projects, and therefore limited the number of new starts in this conference agreement.

Funding for Title II of the bill, which includes the Central Utah Project Completion Account and the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, is \$986.5 million, \$14 million above the amount appropriated last year and \$64 million above the budget request. The Committee did not provide the \$15 million requested by the Administration for the CALFED Bay-Delta program. The authorization for this program expired in fiscal year 2000 and it has not been reauthorized.

Total funding for Title III, the Department of Energy is \$22 billion, \$1.2 billion above fiscal year 2003 and \$120 million below the budget request.

In many ways, I am most proud of our accomplishments in this part of the conference agreement. My top priority in the Energy and Water bill this year was to provide sufficient funding for the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository, and I believe we succeeded. This conference agreement provides a total of \$580 million for Yucca Mountain, only \$11 million below the request but an increase of \$123 mil-

lion compared to the current fiscal year. This project has been significantly underfunded in prior years, and we are finally starting to reverse that trend.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we keep the Department of Energy on schedule to submit the repository license application late next year and to begin repository operations in 2010. The Yucca Mountain repository is essential for both energy security and homeland security. We have provided the necessary funding in this conference agreement, and I have the commitment of the Secretary of Energy to move forward aggressively on the repository program during this coming fiscal year.

Another priority of mine, and of many other Members in this chamber, is the subject of advanced scientific computing. By a number of key measures of computing power, the United States is now in second place behind Japan. For the sake of our scientific leadership, of our national security, and for economic competitiveness, we cannot afford to stay in second place for very long. We have provided an additional \$30 million for the Department of Energy to procure additional state-of-the-art computers in the near term and to begin an inter-agency effort to develop next-generation computer architectures.

Another area where there is significant Member interest in this conference agreement is the portion of DOE's budget that deals with several new nuclear weapons initiatives proposed by the Administration. I strongly believe that we need to take a hard look at our existing Cold War nuclear arsenal before we start down the path of designing new weapons and new weapons infrastructure. As President Bush said when he announced reductions to the nuclear stockpile on November 13, 2001, "The United States and Russia have overcome the legacy of the Cold War." At that time, he pledged that the United States would reduce our stockpile to 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed warheads over the next ten years. Unfortunately, we are still waiting for the Department of Defense, and the Department of energy, to deliver a revised nuclear stockpile plan that reflects the President's commitment of two years ago. It is time for DOD and DOE to take a hard look at our nuclear weapon stockpile and on the infrastructure we are maintaining to support that stockpile.

Mr. Speaker, the funding provided in this conference agreement maintains our strong support for DOE's nonproliferation programs in Russia and other countries. This agreement also makes a key change in DOE's contracting culture, as we require the competition of five laboratory contracts that we awarded without competition back in the 1940s and have never been competed since. Most Members are shocked to learn we have contracts that have never been competed in the past half century. We are fixing that situation.

Funding for Title IV, Independent Agencies, is \$229.3 million, an increase of \$22.6 million from last year and \$81.4 million above the budget request. We have funded the Appalachian Regional Commission at \$66 million, \$33 million above the request, in recognition of the strong interest in this chamber and in the Senate in the work of the ARC.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman PETE DOMENICI, and his Ranking Minority Member, Senator HARRY REID, for their

hard work during this conference. They may view me as a relatively junior Member by Senate standards, but rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that I fought long and hard to defend the House priorities during this conference. My Ranking Member, the Honorable PETE VISCLOSKEY, was at my side during this process, and I truly value his support and advice.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I would also like to thank the staff for their help in getting me up to speed on the complex issues we have in this bill. The Subcommittee staff includes Bob Schmidt, Kevin Cook, Dennis Kern, Scott Burnison, Tracy LaTurner, and our detailee from the Corps of Engineers, Robert Pace. I also want to thank Kenny Draft of my staff, and Dixon Butler and Peder Maarbjerg of the minority staff.

I urge the unanimous support of the house for adoption of this conference report. I would

hope we could quickly conclude action on this conference report so that we can get this bill to the White House for signature.

I want to make special mention here today for "Silent Bob" Schmidt, the subcommittee clerk on my bill this year.

Bob is leaving the Hill at the end of this week, and is going on to greener pastures. I hate to say it, but his departure may be partly my fault. He has the remarkable record of having clerked for five different Chairmen, I believe, in the past five Congresses. He apparently likes the challenge of breaking in new Chairmen, and I told him I intend to be around for a while, so that may be why he's going. I hope not.

I would like to congratulate Bob on his many years of service on the Appropriations Committee, and for his former service for the Corps of Engineers. Bob's knowledge of the

agency programs in our bill, and of the rules of the Committee and the house, have been invaluable during my first year as Chairman on this subcommittee. I will miss his experience and his company, and I know that the staff will, too.

I like to refer to Bob as "silent Bob" because he's not a real talkative guy, so I am not sure that we'll notice when he is out of the office, even when he is gone for good. He usually managed to speak up, though, when anybody was about to make a mistake, which is one hallmark of a very good Appropriations Clerk and I know we will all miss him when it's time to get the work done. On behalf of those of us who have worked closely with him, I want to wish him every success in his golf game and whatever else he takes on in the future.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL - FY 2004 (H.R. 2754)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General investigations.....	134,141	100,000	117,788	131,700	116,949	-17,192
Construction, general.....	1,744,598	1,350,000	1,642,911	1,538,000	1,722,319	-22,279
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.....	342,334	280,000	301,054	329,000	324,222	-18,112
Operation and maintenance, general.....	1,927,556	1,939,000	1,932,575	2,014,000	1,967,925	+40,369
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	39,000	---	---	---	---	-39,000
Regulatory program.....	138,096	144,000	144,000	139,000	140,000	+1,904
FUSRAP.....	144,057	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	-4,057
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	14,902	70,000	40,000	40,000	---	-14,902
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-83).....	60,000	---	---	---	---	-60,000
General expenses.....	154,143	171,000	164,000	160,000	160,000	+5,857
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil.....	4,698,827	4,194,000	4,482,328	4,491,700	4,571,415	-127,412
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Central Utah Project Completion Account						
Central Utah project construction.....	23,489	27,040	27,040	36,463	27,040	+3,551
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	11,186	15,423	9,423	---	9,423	-1,763
Subtotal.....	34,675	42,463	36,463	36,463	36,463	+1,788
Program oversight and administration.....	1,317	1,728	1,728	1,728	1,728	+411
Total, Central Utah project completion account..	35,992	44,191	38,191	38,191	38,191	+2,199
Bureau of Reclamation						
Water and related resources.....	808,203	771,217	817,913	859,517	857,498	+49,295
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	25,000	---	---	---	---	-25,000
Loan program.....	---	200	200	200	200	+200
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	48,586	39,600	39,600	39,600	39,600	-8,986
California Bay-Delta restoration.....	---	15,000	---	---	---	---
Working capital fund (rescission).....	---	-4,525	-4,525	-4,525	-4,525	-4,525
Policy and administration.....	54,513	56,525	56,525	54,425	55,525	+1,012
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	936,302	878,017	909,713	949,217	948,298	+11,996
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	972,294	922,208	947,904	987,408	986,489	+14,195
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy supply.....	696,858	748,329	691,534	920,357	737,537	+40,679
Non-defense site acceleration completion.....	---	170,875	170,875	171,875	163,375	+163,375
Non-defense environmental management.....	213,624	---	---	---	---	-213,624
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....	---	418,124	392,002	396,124	416,484	+416,484
Non-defense environmental services.....	---	292,121	320,468	302,121	339,468	+339,468
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation.....	453,409	---	---	---	---	-453,409
Science.....	3,261,328	3,310,935	3,480,180	3,360,435	3,451,700	+190,372
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	11,000	---	---	---	---	-11,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal.....	144,058	161,000	335,000	140,000	190,000	+45,942
Departmental administration.....	205,280	326,306	224,329	309,564	216,533	+11,253
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-120,000	-146,668	-123,000	-146,668	-123,000	-3,000
Net appropriation.....	85,280	179,638	101,329	162,896	93,533	+8,253
Office of the Inspector General.....	37,426	39,462	39,462	39,462	39,462	+2,036

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL - FY 2004 (H.R. 2754)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>						
National Nuclear Security Administration:						
Weapons activities.....	5,914,409	6,378,000	6,117,609	6,473,814	6,272,511	+358,102
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	67,000	---	---	---	---	-67,000
Defense nuclear nonproliferation.....	1,020,860	1,340,195	1,280,195	1,340,195	1,327,612	+306,752
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	148,000	---	---	---	---	-148,000
Naval reactors.....	702,196	768,400	768,400	768,400	766,400	+64,204
Office of the Administrator.....	325,102	347,980	341,980	337,980	339,980	+14,878
<b>Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration.....</b>	<b>8,177,567</b>	<b>8,834,575</b>	<b>8,508,184</b>	<b>8,920,389</b>	<b>8,706,503</b>	<b>+528,936</b>
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	5,428,806	---	---	---	---	-5,428,806
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	6,000	---	---	---	---	-6,000
Defense facilities closure projects.....	1,130,915	---	---	---	---	-1,130,915
Defense site acceleration completion.....	---	5,814,635	5,758,278	5,770,695	5,651,062	+5,651,062
Defense environmental management privatization.....	157,369	---	---	---	---	-157,369
Defense environmental services.....	---	995,179	990,179	987,679	991,144	+991,144
Defense environmental management privatization (rescission).....	---	---	---	-15,329	-15,329	-15,329
<b>Subtotal, Defense environmental management.....</b>	<b>6,723,090</b>	<b>6,809,814</b>	<b>6,748,457</b>	<b>6,743,045</b>	<b>6,626,877</b>	<b>-96,213</b>
Other defense activities.....	511,659	636,154	666,516	492,209	674,491	+162,832
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	4,000	---	---	---	---	-4,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	312,952	430,000	430,000	285,000	390,000	+77,048
Cerro Grande fire activities (rescission).....	---	-75,000	-75,000	---	---	---
<b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....</b>	<b>15,729,288</b>	<b>16,635,543</b>	<b>16,278,157</b>	<b>16,440,643</b>	<b>16,397,871</b>	<b>+668,603</b>
<b>Power Marketing Administrations</b>						
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	4,505	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	+595
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	27,200	28,600	28,600	28,600	28,600	+1,400
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	167,760	171,000	171,000	177,950	177,950	+10,190
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund.....	2,716	2,640	2,640	2,640	2,640	-76
<b>Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....</b>	<b>202,181</b>	<b>207,340</b>	<b>207,340</b>	<b>214,290</b>	<b>214,290</b>	<b>+12,109</b>
<b>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	192,000	199,400	192,000	199,400	204,400	+12,400
Revenues applied.....	-192,000	-199,400	-192,000	-199,400	-204,400	-12,400
<b>Total, title III, Department of Energy.....</b>	<b>20,834,432</b>	<b>22,163,367</b>	<b>22,016,347</b>	<b>22,148,203</b>	<b>22,043,720</b>	<b>+1,209,288</b>
<b>TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	70,827	33,145	33,145	71,145	66,000	-4,827
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	18,876	19,559	19,559	19,559	19,559	+683
Delta Regional Authority.....	7,948	2,000	2,000	7,000	5,000	-2,948
Denali Commission.....	47,688	9,500	---	48,500	55,000	+7,312
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	577,806	618,800	618,800	618,800	618,800	+40,994
Revenues.....	-520,087	-538,844	-538,844	-538,844	-538,844	-18,757
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>57,719</b>	<b>79,956</b>	<b>79,956</b>	<b>79,956</b>	<b>79,956</b>	<b>+22,237</b>
Office of Inspector General.....	6,797	7,300	7,300	7,300	7,300	+503
Revenues.....	-6,392	-6,716	-6,716	-6,716	-6,716	-324
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>+179</b>
<b>Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.....</b>	<b>58,124</b>	<b>80,540</b>	<b>80,540</b>	<b>80,540</b>	<b>80,540</b>	<b>+22,416</b>
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	3,179	3,177	3,177	3,177	3,177	-2
<b>Total, title IV, Independent agencies.....</b>	<b>206,642</b>	<b>147,921</b>	<b>138,421</b>	<b>229,921</b>	<b>229,276</b>	<b>+22,634</b>
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	26,712,195	27,427,496	27,585,000	27,857,232	27,830,900	+1,118,705
Appropriations.....	(26,712,195)	(27,507,021)	(27,664,525)	(27,877,086)	(27,850,754)	(+1,138,559)
Rescissions.....	---	(-79,525)	(-79,525)	(-19,854)	(-19,854)	(-19,854)

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to say, I always do on these occasions, thank the staff because in the end they are the ones who have done the very hard work. I want to thank Kevin Cook, I want to thank Scott Burnison, I want to thank Dennis Kern, Tracey La Turner, Rob Pace, Kenny Kraft, Rob Nabors, Dixon Butler, Peder Maarbjerg, Leslie Phillips, and I would also like to add my voice of thanks to Bob Schmidt. Bob has done an incredible job as a staff member of the Committee on Appropriations. As a former staffer myself, I truly appreciate the work everyone has done on this bill, and in this case particularly the work of Bob. It is no surprise to me the quality of work he has done since he is a graduate of the University of the Notre Dame.

The second set of thank you's goes to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and I serve together on the Subcommittee on Defense. As mentioned, this is his first full round with the energy and water bill, and he has done an exceptional job. He has been completely bipartisan. He has been a gentleman. He has made decisions. Our Department of Energy and our energy policy in the United States of America is better off because of the work the gentleman has done on this bill.

I have now served with five chairmen; they have all been very able. They have all done very good work; this is the best bill which has been brought to the floor while I have been a ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, on the substance of the bill, I would want to simply say that I think the committee has done a very good job on the nuclear weapons program. On the issue of water infrastructure, we have done our very best. We have added \$377 million, and put back into the process 80 programs that were eliminated by the administration under budget requests. Any failings here are not because of lack of effort by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the staff that worked to put this bill together, Bob Schmidt, Kevin Cook, Scott Burnison, Dennis Kern, Tracey La Turner, Rob Pace, Kenny Kraft, Peder Maarbjerg, Leslie Phillips, Rob Nabors, and Dixon Butler, all put in countless hours to produce this fine product.

I would also like to thank my Chairman, Chairman HOBSON, who guided the House priorities through a very tough Conference, and led us to produce a very good bill. He has been one of the best Chairmen I have ever worked with, and I look forward to working with him in future years.

Now, no bill is perfect Mr. Speaker, but this bill was a product of a truly bipartisan effort.

Mark Twain once said that "Common Sense is not that Common" but this Conference Report advances some very common sense ideas, and though I don't want to take up much time, I would be remiss if I did not mention a few.

In the area of Nuclear Weapons, this Conference Report directs the Dept. of Energy to focus on management of our aging weapons stockpile before moving forward with new concepts and designs.

The Report fenced two-thirds of the money going to Advanced Concepts, or weapons research, until DOE produces a Nuclear Weapons Stockpile plan. This plan is needed to better deal with our aging war-heads and to dispose of many of those systems. Due to advances in technology many warheads are no longer practical or feasible with current Department of Defense technology and strategies.

In addition, the Conference Report, funds the Modern Pit Facility program and the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) or Bunker Buster at, \$10M and \$7.5M respectively, half of the President's and Senate's Requests in both cases. This is because we should not be looking forward to new weapons until we have a solid plan for the weapons and technology we already have.

Mr. Speaker, we should be especially wary of the nuclear waste stored in many sites across this country in this unfortunate time of terrorist threats. The compromise we came to with the other body, funded the Yucca Mountain Repository at it's highest level ever, \$580M, and fully supports the submission of the December 2004 license application. I appreciate the Chairman's leadership on this issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker our funding for the Corps of Engineers was the best that we could do within the money provided. Many important projects could not be fully funded, completed, or started. This under-funding was not the fault of the Chairman or this committee, which funded the Corps approximately \$377 million over the President's Request and restored approximately 80 ongoing studies that the Administration did not include in their budget. Unfortunately, this Administration, and previous Administrations, in a bipartisan failure, have not made the infrastructure of this country a priority.

Currently, the Corps O&M program reflects a high priority backlog of \$1 billion and an additional \$1.9 billion in unfunded work. Though the conference report added \$29 million to the President's request, we are still behind.

For on going construction, the backlog was \$44 Billion for FY 2002 and \$45 billion in FY 2003. The Conference Report added \$372 million to the President's request of \$1.35 billion to help this situation; this is just a drop in the bucket, and I suspect this backlog will continue to grow in FY 2004.

We need to invest in our future, by creating jobs, advancing the efficiency of commerce and transportation, while improving the environmental outlook and quality of life for people in this country. This can all be done through better investment in our domestic infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill as well, and want to

thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON). During no time in my 9 years here have I seen anyone grow as fast on the job in 10 and a half months as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON). His first Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development meeting was coming in as chairman, and in the last 10 and a half months, he has been all across the country, studied these issues, consumed himself with it, and done an outstanding job, in large part because of the bipartisan cooperation. There is no doubt this is a bipartisan product, an excellent work product.

I want to thank again those staff members already mentioned on our side of the aisle, Bob Schmidt, Dennis Kern, Scott Burnison, Kevin Cook, Kenny Kraft, and Tracey LaTurner. They have done outstanding work.

A couple of points I want to make, first as a representative of the premier multipurpose laboratory in the United States, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, science is up. Our long-term investment in the future of our country, the seed corn for the next generation, is up above the President's request because the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) believe we must invest for future generations, and this bill reflects that commitment long term. It is very important. Plus, energy security; everybody has talked for a long time about our need to solve the long-term waste issue relative to our nuclear waste storage and whether we can ever go back into the nuclear business. We are solving that problem by fully funding and adequately funding Yucca Mountain, which we need to do. This committee has moved on this.

We also have an accelerated cleanup program across the country now because this Department of Energy, under Secretary Abraham's leadership, rolled out an ambitious plan to clean these nuclear sites up sooner rather than later and invest more in the short run to save money in the long run. We are doing that at Oak Ridge, at Hanford, Savannah River, and across the country. It is important that we do that for the health and safety of our citizens, and this bill is an excellent work product. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) that this is the best energy and water bill that we have offered in a number of years.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to funding for the Yucca Mountain project in the energy and water appropriations conference report which allocates \$580 million for the Yucca Mountain project and nuclear waste disposal. This is an increase of almost 30 percent above current spending levels. Appropriating such a significant increase of funds for a project which is riddled with problems is unconscionable.

I would like to bring to our attention numerous developments that cloud the

future of the Yucca Mountain project. These issues raise major concerns regarding the wisdom of continuing this dangerous folly. Proponents of Yucca Mountain claim that a central site would reduce security concerns at the Nation's 131 nuclear reactor sites. That is preposterous. Even if Yucca Mountain opens, every nuclear reactor in operation will continue to store nuclear waste on site. Instead of eliminating potential terrorist targets, we will be creating a new target, this time in the State of Nevada.

Nuclear waste shipped to Yucca Mountain will pass through 45 States and the District of Columbia, traveling on roads and railroad tracks located next to 50 million people over the course of the next 24 years. Residents of cities such as Chicago, Atlanta, St. Louis, and Salt Lake City could see multiple shipments of this deadly nuclear waste pass through their backyards daily.

The United States Air Force has stated that the Yucca Mountain repository will interfere with training at the Nellis Air Force Base. This would negatively impact military preparedness at one of the Nation's most important training facilities. It is almost unimaginable that we would consider a plan that would limit the ability to train America's combat pilots.

Just last month, the independent Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board found that the canisters that will store high-level waste at Yucca Mountain are likely to corrode and leak, resulting in the release of radioactive nuclear materials that will contaminate nearby water supplies.

Instead of dumping money into the ill-conceived Yucca Mountain project, we should invest in the development of clean energy sources, such as renewable energy. By boosting renewable energy, we are working to bring down energy costs, create a consistent and reliable source of energy, improve the environment and public health, and reduce our vulnerability to terrorists around the world.

We must look far ahead when considering the future of energy. That future is in reliable, renewable energy, not nuclear power. I urge my colleagues to consider the consequences of this project. This Congress will rue the day it got into bed with the nuclear industry. The people of the State of Nevada already do.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this conference report and want to commend the chairman and his staff on very, very fine work. I particularly thank them for their willingness to work with those of us from Appalachian districts for funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. That is a part of

America that is very rural, it is a part of America that is struggling economically, and with the tremendous loss of manufacturing jobs recently, it is an agency that we believe needed to be funded. We are also pleased that he helped us put language in the bill that said those who receive this funding will be accountable publicly. We want to make sure that these agencies serve us, and that they are open. The language requires that their budgets, their minutes, their audited statements and public meetings be open to the press and public. We thank them for that.

I also commend the committee on authorizing \$2.15 billion for hydrogen fuel cells. It is a program I have supported for years. I commend the committee on authorizing \$200 million for clean cities. I represent State College, Pennsylvania, which is the first bus system that will be all natural gas, and are now working toward becoming hydrogen, and are leading the way. I thank the committee for the \$100 million for increased hydropower which is important. We have a lot of dams in this country which have not been harnessed and hydropower which has not been adequately utilized, and I want to particularly thank the committee for its dramatic increase for LIHEAP from \$2 billion to \$3.4 billion. With the high cost of natural gas and fuel oil this year, home heating is going to be a problem in cold parts of this country, and this program will be vital. I also was delighted at the \$1.8 million clean coal power spending; and I want to thank the chairman and those who worked with him on Yucca Mountain. I know it is a controversial issue, but it needed legislative leadership and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) provided that. I thank him for his work.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to two provisions in this energy and water conference report. First, this bill provides \$7.5 million for study of a new-generation, earth-penetrating nuclear warhead and \$6 million for research on advanced nuclear weapons concepts such as low-yield mini nukes. Supporters of these new nuclear weapons argue the current funding is limited to weapons research and development in DOE labs, but this argument ignores the obvious end results of these studies, and that is that they will have to be tested. These weapons will be tested most likely at the Nevada test site. That will once again expose Utah and the rest of this Nation to fallout from those tests.

High-yield weapons present an additional problem, unacceptable amounts of fallout would endanger U.S. troops approaching the target to confirm the weapons' success. No one is going to argue about pursuing new technologies to address the threats posed by terrorists hiding in hardened or deeply-buried sites, but we should ask and answer

this question about whether nuclear weapons, regardless of yield, can even get the job done.

I oppose this bill that would once again move toward exposing Utahans to nuclear testing in Nevada. That brings me to a second point I also raise in opposition to the bill, and that is there is a provision that would reclassify radioactive waste from two Department of Energy sites as a type of waste that can be shipped to commercial facility. This language was included in the conference report without the knowledge of States like Utah that had commercial facilities where the DOE has suggested shipping such highly-concentrated radioactive waste. This waste has much higher radioactive levels than other radioactive waste that commercial facilities are currently regulated to accept under this classification.

This is unacceptable to Utah, and I am fundamentally opposed to language that makes Utah into a dumping ground not only for waste from Ohio and New York, but waste from other east coast States as well. Some Members argue this waste is not that bad. Mr. Speaker, if the waste is not that bad, then Ohio and New York should not be in such a rush to get rid of it.

Utah has a history on this issue, a history of being downwinders. My family comes from southern Utah. I would not put Utah into a back seat to anyone when it comes to their patriotism and commitment to this country, but we need to make sure when we move ahead and potentially expose our citizens to radiation, that we make sure we make these decisions in the clear light of day, and we look out for the health and safety of all Americans.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, but I have some concerns. There are 60 separate authorizations in this bill; 10 were cleared through my committee. The remaining came from the other body. What bothers me is we have sent over to the other body a WRDA bill that they should be acting on. When we have that many projects in an appropriations bill without having to go through the due process, including my committee, I think it is inappropriate.

I have worked with the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee. My staff has worked with them, and we worked through what the House projects should be and they were cleared. But now we see a small WRDA bill. When the conference report was filed, I was a little shocked. In fact, it has two projects in this bill which were not asked for by either the House or Senate. Two projects were inserted by the Corps itself. I think this is a bad way to legislate.

The bill overall is a good bill, but what we ought to be doing is passing a

WRDA bill out of the other body and getting that done because this Nation needs a sound policy. This Nation needs restoration, it needs a sound project list to conclude.

The chairman and the ranking member did an outstanding job, but I hope this body keeps insisting to Members of the other body, two of them from each State, urge them to pass that piece of legislation that covers the whole Nation and not do it piecemeal, because it weakens the process and makes it difficult to do what we should be doing. I ask Members as we approach next year, we urge that body to act responsibly.

□ 1500

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman is reminded not to urge action in the other body.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the chairman at all. As a matter of fact, the chairman, I, and the ranking member tried when we passed this bill in the House to not put any authorizing language in this bill that was not approved by the chairman when it left here. In our discussions with the other body, they have a different procedure. We had certain things that we had to take the way the procedures works.

I would suggest that we do need to pass a water bill, and I think my ranking member agrees with me on that. We want to work with the gentleman from Alaska in every way we can. There are two large things that were approved over here that I think substantially hurt that, but they were requests from the Senate which I think the gentleman is aware of which we passed by the committee.

But again just generally I want to say, not only generally but specifically, I totally agree with the fact that we should pass a water bill as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just for a moment agree with both of my chairs and refer to my opening remarks where, despite our best efforts, we are also on the appropriations side underfunding these programs. I would agree with the chairman of the authorizing committee that I would hope the other body acts sooner rather than later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), my partner in this. This is the first time we have done this bill together. He and his staff have been absolutely marvelous to work with. We have tried to expose to each other all of our problems. If we would have had more

money, we could have helped more people. That is our goal, with the very delicate infrastructure that we have in this country; but we just did not have enough money to do that.

In closing, I would like once again to say that I appreciate the clerkship of Bob Schmidt and all of the staff, but especially Bob. In the time I have worked with him, he has been an invaluable resource. We are going to miss him a lot.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 2754, the Fiscal Year 2004 Energy and Water Appropriations Conference Report. However, I am concerned about one provision which was added to the statement of managers concerning the Bonneville Power Administration. Incorrect language was added stating "the conferees are aware of the Department of the Treasury's concerns relating to Bonneville Power Administration's financial accounting practices and expect Bonneville to rectify the situation as soon as is possible." The Department of the Treasury has not expressed concerns relating to BPA's accounting practices. In fact, a letter from Treasury Acting Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, Brian Roseboro, to Stephen Wright confirms that no concerns about BPA's accounting practices exist. The letter, dated November 18, 2003, states:

Dear Mr. Wright: The Department of the Treasury received the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2754 and reviewed the sentence on page 171 that reads, "The conferees are aware of the Department of the Treasury's concerns relating to Bonneville Power Administration's financial accounting practices and expects Bonneville to rectify the situation as soon as is possible." The Department of the Treasury has not expressed any concern about the financial accounting practices of Bonneville either privately or publicly. Please let me know if you have any questions. Sincerely, Brian C. Roseboro, Acting Under Secretary for Domestic Finance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the RECORD to reflect the fact that this sentence added to the Conference Report is incorrect, and the letter from Under Secretary Roseboro corrects the RECORD.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their hard work in producing an Energy and Water Appropriations bill that funds a number of important programs. This legislation includes significant increases over the President's request for Basic Energy Research and for Energy Supply programs.

Sadly, this bill also marks a watershed in U.S. nuclear policy that will have dire consequences for us and for our children. Indeed, by funding research on adapting nuclear weapons for new uses against hard and deeply buried targets and funding work on new low yield nukes, Congress has given its stamp of approval to a persistent effort by this administration to put the United States back in the business of making nuclear weapons.

The funding of these two initiatives has been the culmination of the work of nuclear hawks in the administration who had produced a Nuclear Posture Review in December of 2001 that places a strong emphasis on the use of nuclear weapons for both offensive and defensive purposes and a misguided National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction in December 2002 that outlines new

scenarios when the United States would consider using nuclear weapons.

The development not only marks a new chapter in American national security policy that directly invites a nuclear arms race with any power that wishes to compete, but also a shameful moment for Congress when elected officials have been too willing to embrace a new weapons program without challenging what have been very lightweight justifications.

Mr. Speaker, nuclear weapons will remain a crucial part of America's arsenal for the foreseeable future. They provide a hedge against potentially hostile nuclear powers and underpin security commitments to our allies. But today, the United States is addressing the threat of weapons of mass destruction from Iran, North Korea, India, Pakistan and a growing list of counties.

The Director of the CIA, George Tenet, warned last February that the "desire for nuclear weapons is on the upsurge "among small countries" and that "we have entered a new world of proliferation."

Even Russia, our former Cold War rival whom we fought in a conflict that almost brought the world to the brink of annihilation, on noting the administration's current intent to pursue a new generation of nuclear weapons, has responded by making plans to strengthen its nuclear deterrent by modernizing delivery vehicles and keeping a number of heavy ballistic missiles previously slated for dismantlement.

Instead of working to build an equitable global regime that actively devalues nuclear weapons and creates incentives for their elimination, the administration would rather develop new battlefield nuclear capabilities, leading us into a world where nuclear weapons are seen as legitimate alternatives for all nations and the taboo on their use is severely eroded.

The administration's intent to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons of any size makes a mockery of the President's claim that the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) he signed with Russian President Putin marked the true end of the Cold War.

Indeed, if you combine the repeal of the ban on development of low yield nuclear weapons contained in the Defense Authorization Bill with the funding of these same weapons in this bill and the flexibility in the SORT which allows both Russia and the United States too keep all their weapons rather than dismantle them, we actually have the makings of a nuclear arms buildup in this country for the first time since the end of the Cold War.

While this bill cuts funds in half for the Robust Earth Penetrator and ties \$4 million of the \$6 million requested for advanced concepts to an important reporting requirement, there is no such thing as opening Pandora's box part way.

With this bill, the United States has crossed a major threshold and entered a new nuclear era.

By approving the administration's request for plans to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons, Congress has failed the American people by adopting policies that potentially make the United States less secure.

The justifications the administration offered for its nuclear agenda—the need to maintain the knowledge of our nuclear designers and the need to strengthen our nuclear deterrent by developing more usable nuclear weapons—were paper thin.

The first justification deserves little comment. The argument that Congress needs to create a jobs program for scientists to help hone their skills doesn't hold water.

Second, the proposition that nuclear weapons can somehow be engineered to be smarter and cause less collateral damage is simply false.

Nuclear weapons will never surgically destroy hardened targets.

They offer no guarantee of destroying chemical and biological agents without releasing them into the atmosphere.

Detonated in an urban area, even a 1-kiloton nuclear bomb with a yield much lower than the nuclear warheads under consideration for an RNEP would kill tens of thousands of civilians and hinder friendly troops.

Our warfighters do not have a military requirement for new nuclear weapons, and we have not exhausted research on conventional alternatives.

I am deeply concerned that by preaching the rhetoric of disarmament and nonproliferation, and on the other hand, developing a new generation of weapons of mass destruction, we are making the world a more dangerous place. Perhaps the most alarming thing this Congress has done is to trivialize nuclear weapons and their destructive power.

The prohibition on low yield weapons not only was necessary, it reinforced the notion that nuclear weapons should always be considered the most destructive weapons known to man.

By lifting the ban on research and funding their development in this bill, it is much easier to believe that they are just like any other usable weapons system, rather than a horrific weapon of last resort.

The American people are poorly served when the executive branch does not engage them on policies that may have catastrophic consequences for them in the future and when their elected officials are reluctant to ask the hard questions or thoroughly review the administration's national security propositions.

I am going to vote for this bill because it contains a number of important provisions for our economy.

It will be up to this Congress and subsequent Congresses however, to ensure that the administration's quest for new and more usable nuclear capabilities does not take us closer to the day when we decide to use them again.

We did not heed the protests of the current mayor of the city of Hiroshima who wrote the President on the anniversary of the bombing of his city this summer that "this clear indication that the United States intends to develop small nuclear weapons raises the horrifying specter that nuclear weapons will actually be used" and represents a "frontal attack on the process of nuclear disarmament."

If today we are unwilling to listen to those who have the only experience of the consequences of nuclear war, I hope that in the very near future we can at least start giving proper attention to this development in future hearings and debates.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2004 energy and water appropriations conference report, which funds several projects of great interest to my constituents in Southern California.

The New River has been described as the "world's most polluted river." The river flows

from Mexico, north across the U.S. border, and through my district in Imperial County, California. Due to grossly inadequate sewage treatment and solid waste facilities in Mexico, raw sewage, industrial waste, and garbage are constantly released into the New River.

The New River is extremely polluted, foamy, and foul-smelling. The river significantly violates water quality standards, and plants and animals cannot survive in much of it. The New River continues to threaten the health of residents of my district and of undocumented immigrants who use the waterway to cross the international border.

A coalition of citizen groups and government agencies in my district, including the Calexico New River Committee, has developed a feasible plan that will significantly improve the quality of water flowing through the community. The project involves building wastewater infrastructure to improve water quality in the vicinity of the city of Calexico on the southern portion of the New River in Imperial County by installing project headworks and encasing the New River, and constructing a disinfecting facility and wastewater polishing system as the river emerges from its encasement.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, which provides funding for the Nation's energy and water-related projects, would continue environmental restoration efforts on the New River. This is an extremely important first step in the process of enhancing the water quality of the southern portion of the New River, enriching life in the community, and making a healthier home for fish and wildlife.

Better quality water flowing along the New River would also mean improved water quality in the Salton Sea. The Salton Sea is the largest inland water body in California, and one of the largest salt lakes in the world. The Salton Sea is an important habitat for Federal and State listed endangered species, as well as other migrating and resident bird species, a reservoir for agricultural drainage, a center for recreation, and a wetland ecosystem.

But it is quickly becoming too saline to continue supporting wildlife, and a recent rural-to-urban water transfer may shrink the shoreline. This bill would provide funding for the Salton Sea Research project for efforts to continue study of the alternatives for restoration of the Sea.

Water that eventually drains into the Salton Sea comes from the Colorado River, and is delivered to farmers and residents in my community by the All American Canal. This bill provides funding to construct small regulating reservoirs on the canal, which will vastly improve operating efficiencies. The reservoirs would provide storage for water that is unavoidably delivered from the lower Colorado River in excess of what is immediately needed by users, thereby improving water conservation efforts.

Finally, water in the Colorado River is threatened by a uranium mine tailings pile sitting only 700 feet from the River near Moab, Utah. The tailings, which sit in an unlined pond and seep into the ground water, are radioactive and contain high concentrations of toxic metals left by the leaching process used to separate uranium from ore. The tailings are leaking radioactive material into the Colorado River at levels 1,300 times above the allowed limit. This bill provides funding to accelerate remediation of this site, and would ensure that residents of my community, other Colorado

River water users, and the environment receive the long-term protection so desperately needed.

For the sake of my constituents at the U.S.-Mexico border, as well as residents of the West, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member supports the FY2004 Energy and Water Development appropriations conference report and urges his colleagues to vote for it. This Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the Chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the Ranking Member of the subcommittee, for their exceptional work in bringing this conference report to the Floor.

This Member recognizes that extremely tight budgetary constraints made the job of the subcommittee much more difficult this year. Therefore, the subcommittee is to be commended for its diligence in creating such a fiscally responsible measure. In light of these budgetary pressures, this Member would like to express his appreciation to the subcommittee and formally recognize that the Energy and Water Development appropriations conference report for fiscal year 2004 includes funding for several water projects that are of great importance to Nebraska.

This Member greatly appreciates the \$18 million funding level provided for the four-State Missouri River Mitigation Project. The funding is needed to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the Federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river are gone. An estimated 475,000 acres of habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri and Kansas have been lost. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed in pre-development days.

In 1986, the Congress authorized over \$50 million to fund the Missouri River Mitigation Project to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the construction of structures to implement the Pick-Sloan plan.

Also, this measure provides additional funding for flood-related projects of tremendous importance to residents of Nebraska's First Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, flooding in 1993 temporarily closed Interstate 80 and seriously threatened the Lincoln municipal water system, which is located along the Platte River near Ashland, Nebraska. Therefore, this Member is extremely pleased that this conference report continues funding in the amount of \$191,000 for the Lower Platte River and Tributaries Flood Control Study. This study should help formulate and develop feasible solutions which will alleviate future flood problems along the Lower Platte River and tributaries.

This Member recognizes that this bill includes \$546,000 for the Sand Creek Watershed project in Saunders County, NE, and \$318,000 for the Western Sarpy-Clear Creek project. This funding is to be used for pre-construction engineering and design work. This Member is also very pleased that the conference report includes construction funds for several Nebraska projects including \$500,000 for Sand Creek, \$500,000 for Western Sarpy-Clear Creek, \$1.5 million for Antelope Creek,



and \$1 million for Missouri National Recreational River.

Funding for the Sand Creek project is particularly urgent. There is a cooperative effort in Nebraska between the State highway agency and water development agencies which makes this project more cost-effective and feasible. Specifically, the dam for this small reservoir is to be a structure that the Nebraska Department of Roads would construct instead of a bridge as part of the new State expressway in the immediate vicinity of Wahoo, NE. Immediate funding would help ensure that this coordinated effort could continue.

This Member appreciates the report language which directs "the Secretary of the Army to work closely with the local sponsor on the Sand Creek Environmental Restoration project, accepting advance funds offered by the sponsor, and agreeing to credits and reimbursements, as appropriate, for work done by the sponsor, including work performed in connection with the design and construction of seven upstream detention storage structures."

The Western-Sarpy-Clear Creek Flood Reduction Project is designed to provide protection to the City of Lincoln's water supply, Interstate 80 and U.S. Highway 6, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad/Amtrak line, telecommunication lines and other public facilities. The project completes and strengthens a levee system, most of which is already in place, to channel water and ice downstream away from the confluence of the Elkhorn and Platte Rivers, which is where major flood problems begin.

The purpose of the Antelope Creek project is to implement solutions to multi-faceted problems involving the flood control and drainage problems in Antelope Creek as well as existing transportation and safety problems all within the context of broad land-use issues. This Member continues to have a strong interest in the project since he was responsible for stimulating the City of Lincoln, the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to work jointly and cooperatively with the Army Corps of Engineers to identify an effective flood control system for downtown Lincoln. The Antelope Creek Flood Control Project is a large project and will have a number of phases of right-of-way acquisition and construction.

This Member appreciates the \$500,000 included in the conference report for research in Nebraska on improved soybean oil for biodiesel fuel. Biodiesel use is growing rapidly, and an improved oil from soybeans developed for Nebraska growers can open new markets for soybean growers, while contributing to a cleaner environment and reducing our Nation's dependence on non-renewable energy sources. Replacing petroleum-based diesel fuel with biodiesel produced from soybean and other vegetable oils can help make the Nation more self-sufficient in energy and reduce air pollution, including emission of "greenhouse gases" contributing to global warming. Biodiesel holds significant potential for expanding markets for soybean growers and processors.

Finally, this Member also is pleased that the conference report includes \$1 million in funds from the Drought Emergency Assistance Program for emergency assistance in Nebraska.

Again Mr. Speaker, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the Chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Sub-

committee, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for their support of projects which are important to Nebraska and the First Congressional District, as well as to the people living in the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Fiscal Year 2004 Energy and Water Appropriations conference report, which brings the Houston Ship Channel project extremely close to completion and provides critical flood relief for residents of the 29th District of Texas.

It was flooding down in Texas yesterday, and this bill is urgently needed down in my hometown of Houston. This bill provides \$35.5 million for the Houston Ship Channel deepening and widening project, which will allow our Nation's second largest port to continue to grow and handle the heavy energy and petrochemical traffic that is necessary for the smooth economic functioning of our Nation.

The Port of Houston is home to the single largest petrochemical complex in the country, with a combined capacity to produce nearly 49 percent of the Nation's petrochemical capacity. By increasing the capability of the ship channel to handle newer, larger tankers more safely, Congress will directly increase the energy security of our Nation at a time of tumultuous energy markets. We need to obtain an additional \$12 million in reprogramming funding next year as the construction on the ship channel nears completion.

The ship channel is one of the primary economic engines in my district and throughout Texas, directly providing tens of thousands of jobs in the greater Houston area and many more thousands across the State.

For flood control, this legislation provides \$750,000 for flood protection construction work along Hunting Bayou, an urban watershed in East-Central Harris County. During Tropical Storm Allison, the most expensive tropical storm in U.S. history, over 8,000 homes flooded in the Hunting Bayou watershed, which is heavily residential and low to moderate income.

The House Energy and Water Appropriations Act for FY 2004 also provides \$774,000 to complete the General Re-evaluation Review for Greens Bayou, a highly populated, but economically disadvantaged watershed in North Harris County. The lack of flood control protections in this watershed leaves these residents and businesses unprotected and resulted in the flooding of over 15,000 structures during Tropical Storm Allison. The most major channel flooding during that event occurred in the Greens watershed, and we need to get moving and start moving dirt down there as soon as possible. This bayou came very close to topping its banks just yesterday.

I offer my deep appreciation to Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for their attention and dedication to these critical economic development and flood protection projects for my constituents down in Houston, TX. I hope to work with them as this legislation goes forward, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2754, the Energy and Water Appropriations conference report for fiscal year 2004. Let me first thank Chairman HOBSON for his strong leadership of our subcommittee's work and to Ranking Member

PETE VISCLOSKEY for his bipartisan approach to this conference report. And my thanks to the subcommittee staff for their tireless efforts to put this conference report together.

While public attention is rightly focused on the war on terrorism abroad, our committee continues to do its part to protect our nation's security at home. The issue of energy security is now clearly before us—our energy facilities and networks must be safe and secure. And we must also continue the critical work of the Department of Energy to do the research and development on domestic sources of energy, reducing the demand of foreign oil imports and to find better ways to protect our nuclear stockpile.

I applaud the chairman for providing \$82 million for the new Office of Electric Transmission and Distribution (OETD), which is \$5 million over the requested amount. The Office of Electric Transmission & Distribution is a new DOE program office formed to help ensure a robust and reliable U.S. transmission grid for the 21st century. I am pleased our subcommittee has provided DOE with the funding needed to lead a national effort to help modernize and expand America's electric delivery system to better ensure economic and national security.

Further, it is important to note the conferees added the \$5 million over the requested amount to allow the Department of Energy to complete its investigation into the causes of the August 14th, 2003 blackout, which highly affected thousands of people in my region of the country. It is important DOE conduct an extensive investigation to get to the bottom of what caused or contributed to the outage so we can take proper steps to ensure such failures are never repeated in the future.

Chairman HOBSON has produced a conference report that continues the Federal commitment to work in partnership with our states and local communities to address such vital needs as flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration and improving our Nation's waterways. By doing so, we are helping to meet critical economic, environmental and public safety needs in virtually every state in the country.

I want to especially thank Chairman HOBSON for his support of top priorities in my home state of New Jersey. Keeping our port open for business is critical to our regional economy and the 229,000 thousand jobs related to port activity in New Jersey and New York. Protecting and restoring our 127 miles of shoreline is vital \$30 billion dollar tourism industry. And, this bill continues to work to protect New Jersey's communities from natural disasters such as flooding and continues New Jersey's special role to provide for a future energy source that is clean and unlimited: that is the work of the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory.

Finally, I want to take a moment of my time to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for their efforts to improve the quality of life that the American people have at home as well as for the Iraqi people abroad. Today, well over 300 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers military and civilian employees are in Iraq assisting the people in many areas. The Corps also provides daily assistance to the reconstruction effort with technical advice for the International Aid Developments program of reconstructing water and sanitation facilities; public facilities, such as hospitals and schools; roads, bridges and

railroads; and airport and seaport rehabilitation. Of vital importance is the Corp's work with the Coalition Provisional Authority, the U.S. State Department, and U.S. engineering societies that help Iraqi engineers gain knowledge lost during the last 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this conference report and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conference Report on H.R. 2754, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2004. As this Congress is well aware, my district of Sacramento, CA, is the most at-risk river city in the Nation. Situated at the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers, Sacramento has narrowly escaped certain disaster twice over the last two decades. My number one priority as a Member of this body has always been to put an end to this grave public safety risk and to provide my constituents with the flood protection they both need and deserve. I am happy to say this bill will do just that. In fact, in the eyes of Sacramento, the passage of this bill is an historic moment.

A major flood along the American River would cripple this economy, causing between \$7 and \$16 billion in direct property damages and likely result in significant loss of life. The Sacramento floodplain is home to half-a-million people, 5,000 businesses providing 200,000 jobs, 160,000 homes, 1,300 government facilities including the State Capital, over 100 schools, six major hospitals, 26 nursing homes, three major freeways systems, and a regional economy that supports over one million people.

For almost as long as Sacramento has been at risk of a catastrophic flood, there has been a dispute over how to resolve the issue. Earlier this year, my colleague JOHN DOOLITTLE and I reached an agreement that moves forward the two most pressing issues for Northern California: flood control and water supply. This bill contains that agreement and successfully addresses both of those issues for the indefinite future.

I would like to take a moment and recognize the tremendous efforts that have made this possible. Without the leadership of Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCOSKY of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee and Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Sacramento would still be fighting for incremental flood control projects. Their recognition of Sacramento's dire flood control situation advanced this solution. On behalf of my constituents, thank you.

More specifically, this bill provides for the construction of the Folsom Dam Mini-Raise. This is the crowning project in a series of vital flood control improvements and surpasses the region's long held goal of reaching 200-year level protection. By raising the existing Folsom Dam seven feet, Sacramento's flood control system will be able to weather a storm 50 percent larger than anything in the recorded history of the watershed. In addition, the project provides a new permanent bridge to replace the Folsom Dam Road, which was closed in February due to security concerns, and for ecosystem restoration on the lower American River. Congressional approval of the Mini-Raise benefits the entire Sacramento region, by addressing not only the area's flood control needs, but also ecosystem restoration, trans-

portation issues and Homeland Security needs.

I am grateful for the continued Federal assistance that Sacramento has received throughout the years to bring us to this moment. That commitment is evident in this bill and will ensure that those living and working in the region will be kept out of harm's way.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 443, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6) to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 443, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 17, 2003, Book II.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on H.R. 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there may be no other bill the House considers this year or next that will benefit America more than H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2003. Let me tell my colleagues what this conference report is about. It is about America's energy security, America's energy reliability, and it is about American jobs.

First, Mr. Speaker, apart from homeland security and defense appropriations, this bill will do more for the security of our country than any legislation that we will consider in a long time. The Middle East remains one of the most dangerous corners of the world, and our heavy dependence upon oil from that region simply cannot continue. That is why H.R. 6 removes the

artificial impediments to domestic oil and gas exploration and development. That is also why the bill takes a 21st-century approach to energy by investing literally billions of dollars into research and technology to promote non-conventional sources of power.

I am pleased, in particular, that we have followed through on President Bush's request to fund the FreedomCar initiative. If hydrogen cars are the wave of the future, and they may well be, then 20 or 30 years from now, people will look back on the investments we make in this conference report as the genesis for zero-emission, highly efficient vehicles. We also make enormous strides in the area of conservation and efficiency. Indeed, according to the American Council on an Energy Efficient Economy, the provisions of this bill in these areas will eliminate the need for 294 new 300-megawatt electricity plants by the year 2020. That is real conservation.

Next, Mr. Speaker, the conference report is about energy reliability. We can have all of the oil, natural gas, coal, and renewable energy in the world; but it does not do us any good if we cannot get the energy to America's families and businesses. Two years ago, we witnessed rolling blackouts in California. And, of course, just 3 months ago, we saw some 50 million Americans in much of the Northeast and Midwest crippled by power failures that could cost the economy billions and billions of dollars. These blackouts are intolerable in the year 2003. We simply cannot permit this. And so we have adopted consensus-based reliability standards that have been negotiated over the past several years.

We have included transmission incentives to build new transmission systems. We have new provisions on siting to make sure we can improve transmission facilities. And we have eliminated artificial barriers to new investment in the electricity grid by repealing the old Public Utility Holding Company Act. In short, when the provisions of H.R. 6 are fully deployed in the marketplace, the American people will be able to count on a stronger, more reliable electricity system.

Finally, H.R. 6 is about jobs. We estimate this conference report will create upwards of 800,000 new jobs, not to mention preserving valuable jobs in manufacturing, construction, agriculture, and technology that are frankly being lost today because of the high energy prices in our society. Here is how: the construction of the new Alaska natural gas pipeline will create some 400,000 direct and indirect jobs. Investment in clean coal technologies will create 40,000 new jobs and 10,000 white collar jobs in math, engineering, physics, and science. The new renewable fuel standard could create as many as 214,000 new jobs alone. Incentives for the solar industry will create 20,000 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. The point is that through a combination of removing barriers to energy